



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,625	09/22/2000	Christopher Cressy	7784-001023/US	8136
65961 7590 12/19/2008 HARNESS DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				
EXAMINER				
CZEKAJ, DAVID J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/667,625
Filing Date: September 22, 2000
Appellant(s): CRESSY ET AL.

Mark Elchuck Reg. No. 33686
Kevin Mierzwa Reg. No. 38049
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/21/08 appealing from the Office action mailed 9/3/08.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,664,004	Paff	12-2003
6,266,082	Yonezawa et al	7-2001

7,194,426	Box	3-2007
7,019,770	Katz	3-2006
6,317,152	Hobson et al	11-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 16-19, 21-30, and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as "Yonezawa").

Regarding claim 16, Paff discloses an apparatus that relates to security systems (Paff: column 1, lines 11-13). This apparatus comprises "generating a plurality of video signals corresponding to a respective view from a plurality of cameras" (Paff: figures 1 and 3, wherein each of the cameras generates a video signal, wherein the respective view is the coverage area of the camera), "generating a security device signal" (Paff: column 9, lines 15-20, wherein the security device signal is the alarm signal), "when the security device signal is generated, automatically changing a display to a first video signal in response to the security device signal" (Paff: column 14, lines 40-45, wherein once the alarm is generated, the corresponding video is displayed on the monitor), and "displaying an icon of the security device on the display corresponding to an alarm state" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-40, wherein the icon changes color based on the alarm state). However, this apparatus lacks the touch screen as claimed. Yonezawa teaches that prior art display systems do not allow the user to freely

rearrange the video (Yonezawa: column 1, lines 47-55). To help alleviate this problem, Yonezawa discloses an apparatus which utilizes “a touch screen” (Yonezawa: column 4, lines 26-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Paff and add the touch screen taught by Yonezawa in order to provide a user with an efficient and friendly interface for implementing camera controls.

Regarding claims 17-18, Paff discloses “wherein the icon corresponds to a security device coverage area” (Paff: figure 5, wherein the icons are shaped based on the coverage area/volume. Note the dome, camera, window, door, and phone icons).

Regarding claim 19, Paff discloses “when the security device signal is generated, generating an audible alarm” (Paff: column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 2, wherein the audible alarm would be the bells or sirens).

Regarding claim 21, Paff discloses “in response to touching an icon, directing movement of the display” (Paff: column 7, lines 38-41, wherein the touching is clicking on the icon, the directing movement of the display is displaying the video corresponding to the clicked icon).

Regarding claim 22, Yonezawa discloses “three-dimensional displays” (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the 3-D window is window 612).

Regarding claim 23, Yonezawa discloses "the icon represents a field of view of coverage of the security device" (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the icon displays the field of view of coverage of the camera).

Regarding claim 24, Paff discloses "the icon is translucent" (Paff: figures 4-5).

Regarding claim 25, Yonezawa discloses "the display comprises a two-dimensional display" (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the 2-D display is the view of the floor plan on the left hand side of the screen).

Regarding claims 26-27, Yonezawa discloses "the icon comprises a 2-D icon on the 2-D display and a 3-D icon on the 3-D display" (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the 2-D icon is the picture of the camera 523, the 3-D icon is the picture of the garbage can 632).

Regarding claim 28, Yonezawa discloses "the display comprises a 2-D and 3-D display on separate screens" (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the two displays are shown to be separate).

Regarding claim 29, Paff discloses "displaying the icon corresponding to the alarm state by changing color of the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-45).

Regarding claims 30, Paff discloses "displaying the icon by changing a material property of the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44, wherein the material property is the color).

Regarding claim 32, Paff discloses "displaying an ongoing alarm with the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44 and 55-60).

Regarding claim 33, Paff discloses "displaying an alarm priority with the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44, wherein the color corresponds to the priority).

Regarding claim 34, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, Paff discloses "displaying past alarm with icon" (Paff: figure 36).

Regarding claim 35, Paff discloses "displaying a tamper status with the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44 and 55-60, wherein the tamper status is the different states which indicate what area has been tampered with).

Regarding claim 36, Paff discloses "displaying a disconnected state of a security device with the icon" (Paff: column 8, lines 24-27, wherein the disconnected state is displayed by changing colors based on whether the icon is selected or deselected/disconnected from the user's view).

Regarding claim 37, Paff discloses "displaying an acknowledged state with the icon" (Paff: column 8, lines 24-27, wherein the acknowledged state is changing the color to indicate/acknowledge the user correctly selected the icon).

Regarding claim 38, Paff discloses "automatically changing a display comprises flying in a predetermined manner to a predetermined view of the security device" (Paff: column 8, lines 30-40. The examiner notes that by starting from the initial zoom setting position and increasing the zoom ratio, a flying effect would be seen on the screen by the user).

Regarding claim 39, Paff discloses "generating audio cues" (Paff: column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 2).

2. Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as "Yonezawa") in further view of Katz (7019770).

Regarding claim 40, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, claim 40 differs from claim 16 in that claim 40 further requires the audio cues to be unique to each security device. Katz teaches that unique tones or cues assigned to objects can help determine whether fraudulent activity has taken place (Katz: column 6, lines 58-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the unique audio cues taught by Katz in order to help better determine when fraudulent activities are taking place.

Regarding claim 41, Paff discloses "the audio cues to comprise a human voice" (Paff: column 21, lines 15-29).

Regarding claim 42, Paff discloses automatically sending hardware commands to other devices in response to an alarm" (Paff: column 6, lines 13-17, wherein the processor sends commands to turn the other devices, or VCR, on and off).

Regarding claim 71, note the examiners rejections for claims 16, 22, and 23.

3. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as

"Yonezawa") in further view of Hobson et al. (6317152), (hereinafter referred to as "Hobson").

Regarding claim 43, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, claim 43 differs from claim 16 in that claim 43 further requires a digital video recorder. Hobson teaches that prior art recording systems may lose vital information (Hobson: column 3, lines 38-40). To help alleviate this problem, Hobson discloses "a digital video recorder" (Hobson: column 3, lines 42-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the digital video recorder taught by Hobson in order to obtain an apparatus that prevents the loss of vital information.

4. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as "Yonezawa") in further view of Box (7194426).

Regarding claim 31, note the examiners rejection for claim 22, and in addition, claim 31 differs from claim 22 in that claim 31 further requires changing the animation of the icon. Box teaches the use of animated icons within security applications (Box: column 7, lines 59-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the animated icon taught by Box in order to easily indicate a changed state to a user).

5. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as "Yonezawa").

Regarding claim 71, Yonezawa discloses an apparatus that relates to image processing (Yonezawa: column 1, lines 8-11). This apparatus comprises “generating a display of an area having a plurality of security devices” (Yonezawa: figures 8 and 10) and “displaying icons of the security devices, where each icon corresponds to a field of view of coverage of the security device wherein the display comprises a touch screen” (Yonezawa: figure 8; column 4, lines 26-35). While Yonezawa fails to explicitly disclose the three-dimensional display, Yonezawa does disclose displaying the video of the corresponding cameras (Yonezawa: figures 8 and 10; column 6, lines 33-67). By displaying the video corresponding to the camera, Yonezawa is displaying the three-dimensional video data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the three-dimensional display taught by Yonezawa in order to provide a more realistic output video to a user.

(10) Response to Argument

- i. On pages 6-7, appellant argues that Paff in view of Yonezawa fail to disclose when a security device signal is generated, automatically changing a display to a first video signal of the plurality of signals in response to the security signal, wherein the display comprises a touch screen. The appellant further argues that the touch screen is not used for automatically changing a display to a first signal.

The examiner notes that the touch screen being used to automatically change the display is not found in the claim. What is found in the claim is

automatically changing a display.....wherein the display comprises a touch screen. Thus, simply turning the touch screen on and off would read on the broadly claimed touch screen. See for example Paff, column 5, lines 27-31. There Paff discloses displaying video images received from the CCTV cameras. Paff further discloses in column 14, lines 35-45, that in response to certain inputs (alarm or "security" signals), displaying the video from that camera on a specific monitor. Yonezawa discloses in column 4, lines 26-35, the use of a touch screen display in a video monitoring apparatus. Hence, the combination of Paff in view of Yonezawa teach when a security device signal is generated, automatically changing a display to a first video signal of the plurality of signals in response to the security signal, wherein the display comprises a touch screen.

- ii. On page 7, appellant argues that there is no motivation for combining Paff with Yonezawa.

Paff discloses in column 1, lines 11-14, an invention that relates to security systems. Yonezawa discloses in column 2, lines 1-14, an invention that relates to a video monitoring apparatus (or surveillance apparatus). Yonezawa further discloses in column 1, lines 47-55, that prior art display systems do not allow the user to freely rearrange the video. To help alleviate this problem, Yonezawa discloses the use of a touch screen display. Hence, the combination of Paff with Yonezawa would allow the user to more freely manipulate the video received from the cameras. Further, since both references are within the same

field of endeavor and contain similar subject matter, the combination is deemed proper.

- iii. On page 8, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose the icon corresponds to a security device coverage volume.

Paff illustrates in figures 4-5, camera icons that show the device coverage area. Paff further discloses in column 7, lines 47-51, that each icon also has a pan/tilt direction icon segment 31PT which indicates the pan and tilt position of the camera. The examiner notes that the pan and tilt direction of the camera will indicate the coverage volume.

- iv. On page 8, appellant argues that Paff in view of Yonezawa fail to disclose touching of an icon.

Paff discloses in column 7, lines 35-45, clicking on an icon on the screen. Yonezawa discloses in column 4, lines 26-35, the use of a touch screen display. By using a touch screen display, a user must "touch" the display to activate certain functions. Hence, the combination of Paff with Yonezawa teach touching an icon.

- v. On page 8, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose the icon is translucent.

Paff illustrates in figures 4-5 different camera icons. The examiner notes that a picture of the wall is seen through the camera icon 31 makes the camera icon 31 translucent.

- vi. On page 9, appellant argues that Yonezawa fails to disclose a three-dimensional icon.

Yonezawa illustrates in figure 8, an icon 632 that has depth. By using depth on the icon, Yonezawa is displaying a three-dimensional icon.

- vii. On page 9, appellant argues that Yonezawa fails to disclose a three-dimensional display and two-dimensional display on separate screens.

Yonezawa illustrates in figure 8 a three-dimensional display and two-dimensional display that are separate.

- viii. On page 9, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose the icon corresponding to an alarm state is performed by changing a material property of the icon.

Paff discloses in column 9, lines 35-45, changing the color of the icon. By changing the color, Paff is changing a material property of the icon. The appellant notes in the arguments that there is a material property in the present specification different from color property, however, the additional property is not found in the claim.

- ix. On page 10, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose displaying an alarm priority with the alarm.

Paff discloses in column 9, lines 35-45, changing the color of an icon and changing the icon (man) between a standing and running man. By changing the color and "man stance", Paff is indicating the priority of the alarm.

- x. On page 10, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose displaying the tamper status with the icon.

Paff discloses in column 9, lines 35-44 and 55-60, changing icon properties according to the different states. By changing the colors associated with different states, Paff is indicating which area has been tampered with.

- xi. On page 10, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose displaying an acknowledge state with the icon.

Paff discloses in column 8, lines 24-27, that upon being selected, the camera icon is highlighted and or colored to visually indicate the camera is currently selected. By visually indicating the current camera is selected, Paff is acknowledging the camera selection.

- xii. On page 10, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose changing the display comprises flying in a pre-determined manner to a pre-determined view of the security device.

Paff discloses in column 8, lines 30-55, defining a zoom parameter for certain cameras. By starting from an initial zoom parameter (upon the selection of the camera for the changed video display, as seen in the above arguments), and increasing the zoom ratio, a flying effect would be seen on the screen by the user.

- xiii. On page 11, appellant argues that Paff fails to disclose automatically sending hardware commands to other devices in response to the alarm signal.

Paff discloses in column 6, lines 13-17, that a processor sends commands to remotely located VCR's for controlling the actions of the VCR's. By controlling

the actions of the VCR's, Paff is sending hardware commands to other devices in response to alarm signals.

- xiv. On page 11, appellant argues that Paff in view of Hobson fail to disclose automatically sending hardware commands to other devices, wherein the other devices include a digital video recorder.

Paff discloses in column 6, lines 13-17, that a processor sends commands to remotely located devices, in this case the devices being VCR's. Hobson discloses in column 3, lines 42-61, a digital video recording system (DVR). Hence the combination of Paff with Hobson teach automatically sending hardware commands to other devices, wherein the other devices include a digital video recorder.

- xv. On page 12, that Paff in view of Box fail to disclose changing the animation of the icon.

Paff discloses in column 9, lines 35-45, changing the color and posture of an icon depending on an alarm state. Box teaches in column 7, lines 59-65, the use of animated icons within security applications. Hence the combination of Paff with Box teaches changing the animation of the icon.

- xvi. On page 12, appellant argues that Yonezawa fails to disclose displaying icons, wherein each icon corresponds to a three-dimensional field of view of coverage of the security device.

Yonezawa illustrates in figure 8, camera icons 521, 523, and 524. By selecting one of these icons, the corresponding three-dimensional field of view

will be displayed as seen in box 612 of figure 8. Hence, Yonezawa teaches displaying icons, wherein each icon corresponds to a three-dimensional field of view of coverage of the security device.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

(12) Evidence Appendix

No evidence has been provided.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dave Czekaj/

Examiner, Art Unit 2621

Conferees:

/Mehrdad Dastouri/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621

Thai Tran, SPE

/Thai Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621